

#2

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Monday, May 19, 2025 12:25:12 PM
Last Modified: Monday, May 19, 2025 12:34:46 PM
Time Spent: 00:09:33
IP Address: [REDACTED]

Page 1: Introduction

Q1 Respondent skipped this question

To what extent do you agree with the selection of these objectives?

Q2 Respondent skipped this question

What are the reasons for your answer to question 1?

Page 2: Strategy for homes and residential allocations (policies S2 and S6)

Q3 Respondent skipped this question

To what extent do you agree with the more dispersed overall spatial strategy for new homes?

Q4 Respondent skipped this question

What are the reasons for your answer to question 3 and if you disagree with the proposed spatial strategy what alternative should we pursue?

Q5 Respondent skipped this question

Is there a site that is proposed to be allocated for housing in policy S6 that you do not support? If so, which site and why?

Q6 Respondent skipped this question

The development sites annex lists development requirements for the allocated sites. Are there additional or different requirements we should be seeking? Please specify which site you are referring to.

Page 3: Strategy for employment land and employment allocations (policies S3 and S7)

Q7

Strongly Agree

To what extent do you agree with the strategy for employment land?

Q8

What are the reasons for your answer to question 7? If you disagree, what alternative location(s) would be better and why?

AC Lloyd and Panattoni are promoting the site at Coton Park East for employment development. The comments here relate principally to that site and its proposed allocation which is supported but in general terms the employment land strategy proposed for the emerging Plan is also supported.

The strategy seeks, inter alia, to allocate sites that are expansions to or well related to existing successful employment areas and major road links; close to the main population including at Rugby so limiting commuting; and offering benefits such as diversity of scale, open space, and other features. This is sensible. Alternatives might instead look to more dispersed or remote locations, places with more challenges in terms of highway capacity, or the Green Belt. Such alternatives would be less sustainable than the strategy proposed.

The site at Coton Park East performs extremely well in relation to this strategy. It is both an expansion of and well related to a highly successful employment area clustered either side of the A426 at Junction 1 of the M6. This is one of the most attractive locations for this type of development anywhere in the Midlands. It is extremely well placed relative to the rest of the urban area so bringing jobs close to local people and putting "Rugby first" in terms of employment and investment. It is also able to provide a range of unit sizes and offer a series of other benefits.

The evidence base (summarised in the Development Needs Topic Paper) identifies need for employment land on smaller and larger sites and to meet a requirement for strategic and local provision. Emphasis is placed on the ability to deliver across a range of requirements and unit sizes. The residual (net) requirement is calculated as 202.5ha; this could increase if some of Coventry's unmet need is included. The allocation of the site at Coton Park East for about 36ha (around 115,000 sq m) will make an important contribution to meeting this requirement.

The technical suitability of the Coton Park East site for development is evidenced by the extant planning permission there for residential use. However, the site is very clearly better suited to employment use positioned as it is alongside existing major employment development and the M6 in a prime employment location, but one that is more of an outlier from a residential perspective, and proven not to be attractive to the residential market. The evidence base (the Stage 2 Site Options Assessment) continues to confirm the suitability of the site for development, now from an employment perspective.

The draft Plan suggests five development requirements for this allocation. The first seeks the provision of 1.2ha of land to assist with the expansion of the Free School. AC Lloyd and Panattoni consider that land can be made available within the site for this purpose, but evidence around the amount and function of the land has not yet been made available. AC Lloyd and Panattoni are in discussion with the relevant educational stakeholders to resolve this and will keep the Council informed of progress in that regard to feed in to the ongoing Plan process. However, on the basis of the information currently available AC Lloyd and Panattoni are of the view that specifying as much as 1.2ha of land is excessive and that a smaller provision is more appropriate.

The second seeks provision for precisely 4,000 sq m of smaller units of up to 1,500 sq m each. AC Lloyd and Panattoni support the principle of providing smaller units, but consider the phrasing of this requirement is too inflexible and would hinder delivery. It is suggested that it is changed to a requirement for at least 4,000 sq m of smaller units of up to 2,750 sq m each.

The evolving masterplan being prepared by AC Lloyd and Panattoni currently shows 4,868 sq m of smaller units made up of two units of 1,068 sq m each and two of 1,366 sq m each. The change suggested above would allow these units to be delivered individually or combined (e.g. the two 1,366 sq m units could be joined to create a larger space of 2,732 sq m for a single occupier). This would provide flexibility for occupiers to take the amount of space they need, and also the ability for them to expand.

The third seeks provision for sufficient overnight lorry parking facilities and the fourth provision of 0.4ha of land for a Gypsy and Traveler site. AC Lloyd and Panattoni consider that the site can accommodate these requirements.

The fifth seeks maintenance of existing PROW along their existing lines with diversions only where this is not practicable. AC Lloyd and Panattoni consider that maintenance of PROW is appropriate but the limitation on diversion should be removed. It might

Questionnaire on Rugby's Preferred Options Consultation Document

Lloyd and Unatoni consider that maintenance of PROW is appropriate but the limitation on diversion should be removed. It might be that a diverted route is preferable in terms of its attractiveness and accessibility to all users, whether maintenance of the existing route would be practicable or not. As such, this requirement might more appropriately look to secure PROW along existing or diverted routes where the outcome in terms of connectivity, attractiveness and accessibility can be demonstrated to be acceptable.

The Plan might also make it clear that with the development of this allocation at Coton Park East the site will become part of the Rugby Urban Area.

Page 4: Gypsy and Traveller sites (policy S4)

Q9 Respondent skipped this question

To what extent do you agree with policy S4?

Q10 Respondent skipped this question

What are the reasons for your answer to question 9?

Page 5: Climate

Q11 Respondent skipped this question

To what extent do you agree with the approach to reducing emissions and adapting to the effects of climate change?

Q12 Respondent skipped this question

What are the reasons for your answer to question 11?

Page 6: Economy

Q13 Respondent skipped this question

To what extent do you agree with the document's economic policies?

Q14 Respondent skipped this question

What are the reasons for your answer to question 13?

Page 7: Centres

Q15 Respondent skipped this question

To what extent do you agree with the policies for retail centres?

Q16 Respondent skipped this question

What are the reasons for your answer to question 15?

Page 8: Environment

Q17

Respondent skipped this question

To what extent do you agree with the document's environmental policies?

Q18

Respondent skipped this question

What are the reasons for your answer to question 17?

Page 9: Housing

Q19

Respondent skipped this question

To what extent do you agree with the document's housing policies?

Q20

Respondent skipped this question

What are the reasons for your answer to question 19?

Page 10: Wellbeing

Q21

Respondent skipped this question

To what extent do you agree with the document's wellbeing policies?

Q22

Respondent skipped this question

What are the reasons for your answer to question 21?

Page 11: Design

Q23

Respondent skipped this question

To what extent do you agree with the document's design policies?

Q24

Respondent skipped this question

What are the reasons for your answer to question 23?

Page 12: Infrastructure

Q25

Respondent skipped this question

To what extent do you agree with the document's infrastructure policies?

Q26

Respondent skipped this question

What are the reasons for your answer to question 25?

Page 13: Any Other Feedback

Q27

Respondent skipped this question

If there are any other comments you wish to make regarding the consultation document which you have not already given in your preceding answers, please enter them here:

Page 14: About you

Q28

What is your name?

██████████

Q29

What organisation are you representing, if applicable?

██████████████████

Q30

Other

Are you a resident of Rugby Borough?

Q31

Your contact email

██████████████████████████████████████

Q32

Your contact address

██████████████████
██████████████████████████████████
██████████
██████████

Q33

Your Postcode

██████████

Q34

[REDACTED]

What is your Gender Identity?

Q35

[REDACTED]

Age

Q36

[REDACTED]

Ethnicity

Q37

[REDACTED]

Do you consider yourself to be disabled?

Q38

[REDACTED]

What is your sexual orientation?

Q39

[REDACTED]

What is your religion or belief?
